

provides that a court ‘may dismiss the case if the allegation of poverty is untrue, or if satisfied that the action is frivolous or malicious.’” *Attwood v. Singletary*, 105 F.3d 610, 613 (11th Cir. 1997) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) (1996)).

This circuit has defined a frivolous appeal under section 1915(d) as being one “‘without arguable merit.’” *Harris v. Menendez*, 817 F.2d 737, 739 (11th Cir.1987)(quoting *Watson v. Ault*, 525 F.2d 886, 892 (5th Cir.1976)). “‘Arguable means capable of being convincingly argued.’” *Moreland v. Wharton*, 899 F.2d 1168, 1170 (11th Cir.1990) (per curiam) (quoting *Menendez*, 817 F.2d at 740 n. 5); *see Clark*, 915 F.2d at 639 (“A lawsuit [under section 1915(d)] is frivolous if the ‘plaintiff’s realistic chances of ultimate success are slight.’” (quoting *Moreland*, 899 F.2d at 1170)).

Sun v. Forrester, 939 F.2d 924, 925 (11th Cir. 1991), *reh’g denied*, 503 U.S. 999 (1992). *See also Weeks v. Jones*, 100 F.3d 124, 127 (11th Cir. 1996) (stating that “Factual allegations are frivolous for purpose of [28 U.S.C.] § 1915(d) when they are ‘clearly baseless;’ legal theories are frivolous when they are ‘indisputably meritless.’”) (citations omitted).

Applying the foregoing standard, this Court is of the opinion that the plaintiff’s appeal is without a legal or factual basis and, accordingly, is frivolous and not taken in good faith.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the plaintiff’s motion to proceed on appeal *in forma pauperis* is DENIED and that the appeal in this cause is certified, pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 1915(a), as not taken in good faith.

DONE this 29th day of June, 2005.

/s/ Mark E. Fuller
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE